

**From:** Raymond, Nate (Reuters) <[Nate.Raymond@thomsonreuters.com](mailto:Nate.Raymond@thomsonreuters.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2022 3:49 PM

**To:** Jandl, Lauren <[Lauren.Jandl@vermont.gov](mailto:Lauren.Jandl@vermont.gov)>

**Subject:** Reuters reporter question -- Opioid litigation

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

Hi Lauren, I'm a reporter with Reuters and have been doing some reporting concerning the national \$26 billion opioid settlement with the big three drug distributors and Johnson & Johnson looking in part at how much of the funding could potentially go to attorneys fees. I understand some states were asked to set up what have been termed "back-stop funds" to allow for the use of settlement money to pay plaintiffs' lawyers who represented political subdivisions in litigation beyond what the national settlement itself set aside. It didn't look like Vermont had done so, and so I was wondering (a) if that's correct, (b) why that is, and (c) if lawyers ever did request the creation of one? If so on the latter question, would you be able to share any letter they sent the AG's office requesting the creation of a back-stop fund?

Nate Raymond

Reuters

Legal Affairs Correspondent

Cell: 347-243-6917

Twitter: [@nateraymond](https://twitter.com/nateraymond)